

STEVEN C. MITCHELL, ESQ., SBN 124644  
ROBERT W. HENKELS, ESQ., SBN 255410  
GEARY, SHEA, O'DONNELL, GRATTAN & MITCHELL, P.C.  
37 Old Courthouse Square, Fourth Floor  
Santa Rosa, California 95404  
Telephone: 707/545-1660  
Facsimile: 707/545-1876

JAMES V. FITZGERALD, III, SBN 55632  
NOAH G. BLECHMAN, SBN 197167  
MCNAMARA, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY,  
BORGES & AMBACHER LLP  
1211 Newell Avenue  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Telephone: (925) 939-5330  
Facsimile: (925) 939-0203

Attorneys for Defendants  
ERICK GELHAUS and COUNTY OF SONOMA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ESTATE OF ANDY LOPEZ, BY AND  
THROUGH SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST,  
RODRIGO LOPEZ AND SUJAY CRUZ, AND  
RODRIGO LOPEZ AND SUJAU CRUZ,  
INDIVIDUALLY,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ERICK GELHAUS, COUNTY OF SONOMA,  
DOES 1 – 10, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV 13 05124 PJH

**JOINT STATEMENT UPDATING THE  
COURT RE: CASE MANAGEMENT  
CONFERENCE**

Date: May 15, 2014  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Courtroom: 3, 3rd Floor, Oakland

The Court previously granted the County of Sonoma's request for a stay, and set the May 15 Case Management Conference date to update the Court to "talk about where to go from there."

As of the time of the preparation of this Joint Statement, the Sonoma County District Attorney's Office has not announced a decision as to whether or not criminal charges will be filed as a result of the officer involved shooting which serves as the basis for this lawsuit. The parties' respective positions on how to best proceed at this time in light of the same are as follows:

**Defendants' Position:**

Defendants do not have any influence over the timing or outcome of the District Attorney's Office investigation and charging decision. The best, most recent information Defendants have with respect to the timing of an intended decision is set forth in a May 5, 2014 newspaper article (copy attached as Exhibit A) in which Sonoma County District Attorney Jill Ravitch is quoted as saying that she had hoped to have a decision within 90 days from their office's receipt of the SRPD investigation regarding the shooting (which occurred on or about January 29, 2014), but has emphasized that the 90 day timeframe was a guideline, not a requirement. District Attorney Ravitch went on record saying that her office is "diligently moving through the investigative reports and evidence," and that the timeline for the final decision will be "determined by the investigation, not politics."

As set forth in defendants' previous motion, until the District Attorney's Office makes its determination as to whether or not criminal charges will be brought against the involved deputies, including defendant Erick Gelhaus, the SRPD investigation containing witness statements and pertinent evidence remains confidential, and defendants will be substantially prejudiced in terms of proceeding forward, including responding to the Complaint, providing any meaningful Rule 26 Initial Disclosures, or otherwise make informed decisions required for an Initial Case Management Conference (including length of trial, appropriate ADR, discovery agreements, etc.), as defendants' counsel do not have the requisite facts and evidence in hand.

Defendants, plaintiffs and the community are all anxious to learn of the District Attorney's Office's decision, but defendants have no reason to believe that the District Attorneys' office is doing anything other than moving as diligently as possible on a high profile case in order to make the best informed decision, and it seems likely that a decision will be forthcoming shortly. For the above reasons, and as further articulated in defendants' motion to stay, defendants request that the Case Management Conference be continued for approximately 30 – 45 days. By that time, it would certainly be hoped and anticipated, for the benefit of all involved, that a final decision will have been made by the District Attorney's Office, and defendants would therefore be in a position to begin defending themselves in the civil case if charges are not brought (including being provided

1 with the underlying investigation and evidence), or if criminal charges are brought, the court will be  
 2 in a position to assess the best course of action from there.

3 Defendants will be in a position to respond to the Complaint and have an Initial Case  
 4 Management Conference, including Rule 26 disclosures, within 30 days of public announcement of  
 5 the charging decision. If the Court is inclined to set an outside date by which defendants would be  
 6 required to respond to the Complaint and set an Initial Case Management Conference, defendants  
 7 suggest setting the same for July 17, 2014.

8 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

9 Plaintiffs respectfully submit that at the very least, a partial lifting of the stay is appropriate  
 10 at this juncture. A limited stay can continue with respect to discovery aimed at Mr. Gelhaus.

11 There is little if any prejudice that would befall defendants if this matter were allowed to  
 12 continue forward. Initial disclosures can be postponed until after a reasonable time after the  
 13 District Attorney makes her decision.

14 The parties should be ordered to meet and confer to discuss a discovery schedule and the  
 15 present defendants should be ordered to answer the complaint in 30 days. This would allow the  
 16 parties to make progress in the prosecution of this case while the parties await the district attorney's  
 17 decision.

18 DATED: May 12, 2014

GEARY, SHEA, O'DONNELL, GRATTAN &  
 MITCHELL, P.C.

20  
 21 By /s/ Steven C. Mitchell  
 STEVEN C. MITCHELL  
 Attorneys for Defendants  
 ERICK GELHAUS and COUNTY OF  
 SONOMA

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

LAW OFFICES OF  
 GEARY,  
 SHEA,  
 O'DONNELL,  
 GRATTAN &  
 MITCHELL  
 P.C.

1 DATED: May 12, 2014

McNAMARA, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY,  
BORGES & AMBACHER LLP

2  
3 By /s/ James V. Fitzgerald  
4 JAMES V. FITZGERALD, III  
5 Attorneys for Defendants  
6 ERICK GLEHAUS and COUNTY OF  
SONOMA

7 DATED: May 12, 2014

CASILLAS, MORENO & ASSOCIATES

8  
9 By /s/ Arnoldo Casillas  
10 ARNOLDO CASILLAS  
11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs,  
12 ESTATE OF ANDY LOPEZ, by and  
13 through successors in interest, RODRIGO  
14 LOPEZ and SUJAY CRUZ, and  
15 RODRIGO LOPEZ and SUJAY CRUZ,  
16 Individually.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 LAW OFFICES OF  
GEARY,  
SHEA,  
O'DONNELL,  
27 GRATTAN &  
MITCHELL  
28 P.C.